FCC Received June 14, 1993 - 11:10 a.m.

ORIGINAL

1	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RECEIVED	
2	Before the JUN 1 7 1993	
3	FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION	
4	Washington, D.C. 20554 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OF FICE OF THE SECRETARY	
5		
6	IN RE APPLICATIONS OF: MM DOCKET NO. 93-93	
7		
8	COMMUNITY TELEVISION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	
9	VALLEY PUBLIC TELEVISION	
10		
11	Bakersfield, California	
12		
13		١
14		l
15		
16		
17		
18		1
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	DATE OF CONFERENCE: June 2, 1993 VOLUME: I	
25	PLACE OF CONFERENCE: Washington, D.C. PAGES: 1-15	

JUN 1 7 1993

1	Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
2	FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554
3	
4	
5	In the matter of:
6	COMMUNITY TELEVISION OF) SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA) MM Docket NO. 93-93
7	and)
8	VALLEY PUBLIC TELEVISION, INC.)
9	
10	The above-entitled matter came on for pre-hearing conference pursuant to Notice before Arthur I. Steinberg,
11	Administrative Law Judge, at 2000 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., in Courtroom No. 3, on June 2, 1993, at 9:00 a.m.
12	APPEARANCES:
13	On behalf of Community Public Television of Southern California:
14	or southern california:
15	THOMAS SCHATTENFIELD, Esquire GERALD McCARTIN, Esquire
16	Arent, Fox, Kintner & Plotkin & Kahn 1050 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 600
17	Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
18	On behalf of Valley Public Television:
	VINCENT J. CURTIS, JR., Esquire
19	Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth 1300 North 17th Street
20	11th Floor Rosslyn, Virginia 22209
21	On behalf of Mass Media Bureau:
22	NORMAL GOLDSTEIN, Esquire
23	2025 M Street, NW Suite 7212
24	Washington, D.C. 20554
25	

1	INDEX		
2			
3		Page	No.
4	Opening Statement by Judge Steinberg	3	
5	Comments by Mr. Curtis	6	
6	Comments by Mr. Schattenfield	9	
7	Comments by Mr. McCartin	14	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17	·		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	Conference Began: 9:00 a.m. Conference	Ended: 9:16 a.m	m.

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, we're on the record now. 3 is a pre-hearing conference in MM Docket No. 93-93, involving mutually-exclusive applications for a construction permit for a new noncommercial educational television station in 6 Bakersfield, California. The case was designated for hearing 7 on April 1st, 1993. By order released April 6th, 1993, the Chief Administrative Law Judge assigned the case to me and set the date of the hearing for August 17th, 1993. A request to 10 extend the hearing date was denied by order FCC 93M-243 11 released May 11th, 1993. 12 Let me first take the appearances for Community 13 Television of Southern California. 14 MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Thomas Shattenfield and Gerald J. 15 McCartin of the law firm of Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin and 16 Kahn. 17 JUDGE STEINBERG: What happened to Mr. Frank? 18 MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Pardon?

JUDGE STEINBERG: What hannened to Mr. Frank?

19

1	carefully.
2	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. For Valley Public Television,
3	Inc.?
4	MR. CURTIS: Vincent J. Curtis, Jr.
5	JUDGE STEINBERG: For the Chief, Mass Media Bureau?
6	MR. GOLDSTEIN: Norman Goldstein.
7	JUDGE STEINBERG: The first thing I want to go over or
8	just briefly recite is the pleadings that I have that are
9	still pending in this case just to make sure everybody is on
10	the same page. The first thing I have is a motion to enlarge
11	issues filed by Valley on May 3rd and which was supplemented
12	on May 4th. The second thing I have is a motion to enlarge
13	issues filed by Community on May 3rd and it was supplemented
14	on May 4th and on May 18th. In connection with the May 18th
15	supplement, Community also filed on that date a motion to
16	accept the supplement. Let me just ask Mr. Curtis, are you
17	going to oppose the motion to accept?
18	MR. CURTIS: Your Honor, I think as we proceed this
19	morning
20	JUDGE STEINBERG: It's going to become moot?
21	MR. CURTIS: these are all going to become moot.
22	JUDGE STEINBERG: Good. Third
23	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: You missed one.
24	MR. McCARTIN: Let the record reflect
25	JUDGE STEINBERG: No, I didn't.

_	<u> </u>	11			
•					
•					
1■					
1					
V:					
-					
<u> </u>					
<u>.</u> -					
	<u> </u>				
	-				
, 1 					
<u> </u>					
~					
<u> </u>					
			}		
<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>			,		
			\ .		
<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>			λ.		
	, ···			•	
					. 4
	, ~ · ·				- 4
	,	<u> </u>			4
		<u> </u>			
	,	<u> </u>			
	,				4
	,				
	,				4
	,				4

1	June 1st date with the understanding that the subject would be
2	discussed at today's conference. That comport with
3	MR. CURTIS: Yes, Your Honor.
4	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.
5	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Yes, sir.
6	JUDGE STEINBERG: Then we'll, we'll get to this date
7	later. Now, I want to talk about settlement. I know that
8	there have been settlement efforts because I've been informed
9	about certain aspects of those efforts and I just would like
10	to ask what the status is.
11	MR. CURTIS: Your Honor, we are pleased to announce
12	that yesterday afternoon we were able to reach a settlement
13	among the party applicants. Basically, the settlement will
14	result in both party applicants dismissing their applications
15	for Channel 39; that Valley would dismiss its objections to
16	the construction permit, the operation of a translator on
17	Channel 67 at Bakersfield by Community. Neither party during
18	the pendency of the settlement would do any publicity.
19	MR. GOLDSTEIN: What does that mean?
20	MR. CURTIS: Well, we're not going around doing any,
21	any publicity outside of whatever filings we have to do. It
22	was, it was
23	MR. McCARTIN: With respect to the settlement
24	discussions
25	MR. CURTIS: Settlement discussions.

1	MR. McCARTIN: would be kept confidential.
2	MR. CURTIS: Neither Valley nor Community would apply
3	for further translators at Bakersfield other than those on
4	which they are operating at the time of the settlement,
5	namely, Channel 65 for Valley and Channel 67 for Community.
6	Valley will not apply for any translators in the future south
7	of the latitude running through the center of Bakersfield.
8	Community will not apply for any translators to the north of
9	the latitude running through Bakersfield. Further, the
10	east/west limitations would be the county lines of Kern
11	County.
12	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: We will not file for any
13	translators north of Bakersfield.
14	JUDGE STEINBERG: You're basically splitting up the
15	area.
16	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Well, no, not really.
17	MR. CURTIS: Well
18	JUDGE STEINBERG: You know, you're going to serve this
19	area, they're going to serve that area.
20	MR. CURTIS: Well, except, except Your Honor, east and
21	west outside of the Kern County
22	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.
23	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Yes. The limitations.
24	MR. CURTIS: Kern County
25	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Boundaries.

1	MR. CURTIS: boundaries, either party could file for
2	additional translators.
3	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.
4	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Anywhere.
5	JUDGE STEINBERG: East and west.
6	MR. CURTIS: East and that's the outside
7	JUDGE STEINBERG: But north and south
8	MR. CURTIS: boundary
9	JUDGE STEINBERG: Yeah.
10	MR. CURTIS: but up and down
11	JUDGE STEINBERG: Yeah. One's going to take the north
12	part and one's going to take south
13	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Within Kern County, within Kern
14	County.
15	MR. CURTIS: Within
16	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.
17	MR. CURTIS: no, no.
18	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: No? Sure.
19	MR. CURTIS: No, no. The north/south thing is not
20	within the county. The north/south thing is through the
21	middle of the of Bakersfield; the east/west is Kern County.
22	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Yeah.
23	MR. CURTIS: That's
24	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Oh, okay, okay.
25	MR. CURTIS: Okay. All right.

1 MR. McCARTIN: There's one other gloss on that -- and 2 that is there's a 10-year limitation. 3 MR. CURTIS: Right, I was going to put that on. 4 will have a 10-year limitation. In other words, the limit 5 would be for 10 years, it wouldn't be forever. And the last 6 thing would be that neither Valley nor Community will either 7 fund, encourage or otherwise be involved directly or 8 indirectly in the efforts of any person or organization with 9 respect to an application for Channel 39 for educational use; 10 nor will they agree to the retransmission of the respective 11 signals by any person or organization receiving authorization 12 for Channel 39 or on any other translator serving the 13 Bakersfield metropolitan area. 14 There is a -- I think there is another point, that if a 15 third party would file for Channel 39 then either one of us 16 could then come back in and refile an application for 39. 17 That I think represents --18 The last thing you said, I --MR. SCHATTENFIELD: 19 seemed a little -- might be accurate a little different than I 20 remember. 21 MR. CURTIS: Okay. 22 MR. SCHATTENFIELD: But with respect to anybody -- we will not aid anybody directly or indirectly filing for Channel 23 24 39, but I -- then you said something about entering into a 25 program agreement which might be -- I don't remember hearing

1	those the retransmission concern, I don't remember hearing
2	that discussed and that might very well might be what it is
3	but can't remember.
4	MR. CURTIS: That was, that was in paragraph numbered
5	nine in Dick's letter to you of May 27th that I thought we
6	agreed to yesterday.
7	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: We didn't discuss that I don't
8	think, but we can work that out. There's no sense in taking
9	the court's time.
10	MR. CURTIS: Okay, but that's basically, Your Honor,
11	what the terms of the agreement would be.
12	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Now, how soon do you think you
13	can get signed packages filed?
14	MR. CURTIS: I would think what do you think, a
15	week, Tom?
16	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Let me suggest June 11th which
17	is a week from Friday.
18	MR. CURTIS: That's fine because yeah, I'm sure we
19	could do that.
20	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.
21	MR. CURTIS: Do you see any problems with that?
22	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: No.
23	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, because let me just say I'm
24	very pleased that you've been able to reach a settlement
25	agreement. I think it I think you both know my feelings

about settlement agreements and that I think that settlement 2 is much to be preferred over litigating and especially 3 litigating which has the potential of going on for years and 4 years and years, and the public is definitely served. So let me just -- I'll set a date of Friday, June 11th 5 6 by which to file a completed settlement package. Let me just 7 say that if a package is not filed by that date then I'm going 8 to order that you commence discovery by that date. 9 words, either on June 11th I'll get a settlement package or 10 I'll get notices of deposition and a joint document request, 11 so you do one or the other. Also being the pessimist that I 12 am, I'm going to set a date of June -- you know, assuming --13 if the settlement package is fine -- if the settlement package 14 is filed on that date, I on my own motion will suspend all the 15 procedural dates. You don't have to -- if you want to file a 16 motion to do that, that's fine, that will serve to remind me, 17 but I usually don't forget those things, you know --18 MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Don't forget those --19 MR. CURTIS: Perhaps we can put that as a footnote or 20 something and --21 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yeah, or as a separate motion, or --22 but I'll do it. If -- but let's just say a settlement package 23 is not filed and something happens and you do decide to go 24 forward, then on June 11th I'll set -- that's the date by 25 which you have to commence discovery by filing notices of

deposition and a joint document production request. 1 2 I'll set June 18th as the date by which to respond to all the 3 pending pleadings, the three motions to enlarge and the motion 4 -- the -- and the petition for leave to amend and -- yes? 5 MR. SCHATTENFIELD: On that score, I didn't mean to 6 interrupt, but if in fact there is a settlement there is no 7 need then to file oppositions, or how do you clean -- how 8 do you --9 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. I'll get to that. 10 MR. SCHATTENFIELD: Okav. 11 You know, the responses -- let me JUDGE STEINBERG: 12 just say, the responses to the second motion to enlarge, it 13 was hand-served or due on June 11th but it's so inextricably 14 intertwined with the petition for leave to amend that it's --15 it would be silly -- it wouldn't, it wouldn't be helpful to me 16 at all to have comments on one filed earlier than comments on 17 the other so that's why on my own motion I would extend the 18 date of the second motion to enlarge to the 18th. 19 June 18th if there's no settlement everything would be due. 20 Let me address Mr. Shattenfield's question. And this 21 -- let me just say that -- well, I won't say that. But given 22 the structure of the settlement, given the fact that both 23 applications will be dismissed, there is no need for me to 24 resolve any of the matters presented in any of the petitions 25 If the allegations are worthy of pursuit, let me to enlarge.

1	just say that they've been made before the Bureau and the
2	Bureau if the Bureau wants to take them up separately with
3	you guys after your applications have been dismissed, that's
4	their concern, it's not mine. I've got your I've got both
5	of your applications in front of me, both which will be
6	both of which will be dismissed and under those circumstances
7	I don't have to address anything. So, if the settlement
8	package is filed and assuming it's okay and there's no
9	problems with it, in the order disposing of the settlement
10	package I would dismiss all the pending pleadings as moot.
11	Let me also say, getting back to the well, I guess I
12	won't address it. You know, the motion to accept the second
13	supplement? What I wanted to do is just grant that. You
14	know, that was the one that which supplemented the petition
15	to enlarge with discovery requests.
16	MR. CURTIS: I would prefer that we don't do anything
17	on that.
18	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, just hold all that up?
19	MR. CURTIS: Yes.
20	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.
21	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: That killed the settlement
22	yesterday.
23	JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, if it's a settlement killer I'm
24	sure I'll get a pleading saying we don't object. Okay. Now I
25	was going to go through my spiel about discovery, but I guess

1	I won't do that.
2	MR. GOLDSTEIN: I don't remember in the petitions to
3	enlarge, were there any character issues raised on either
4	by either one?
5	MR. McCARTIN: Valley raised a an abuse of process
6	issue against us which has already been ruled on by the Bureau
7	in the Channel 67 translator proceeding. There's a petition
8	for reconsideration pending on that ruling, but that petition
9	will be
10	MR. CURTIS: Will be dismissed.
11	MR. McCARTIN: withdrawn as a result of which the
12	ruling by the Bureau on the other proceeding will become
13	final.
14	MR. GOLDSTEIN: So there's no pending or no alleged
15	character problems with respect to either
16	MR. CURTIS: No. We raised qualifying questions
17	against each other, but I don't believe except for the abuse
18	of process question there would be no character question
19	pending.
20	MR. GOLDSTEIN: That will be lingering, okay.
21	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: I think that's right.
22	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Anything else we need to
23	discuss?
24	MR. SCHATTENFIELD: No.
25	MR. CURTIS: I don't believe so, Your Honor.

1	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Then why don't I again
2	thank you very much, I appreciate I know that this was a
3	hard, a hard settlement to reach and I know that you all
4	worked very hard to reach it and I much appreciate it and I'm
5	sure the people in Bakersfield much appreciate it. Thank you
6	very much. We'll go off the record now.
7	(Whereupon, the pre-hearing conference was adjourned.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER, AND PROOFREADER

Name AND VALLEY PUBLIC TELEVISION, INC.
MMADOCKET NO. 93-93 Docket No.
WASHINGTON, D.C.
Place
JUNE 2. 1993 Date
We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers through